

1 Ronald P. Oines (State Bar No. 145016)
roines@rutan.com
2 Talya Goldfinger (State Bar No. 294926)
tgoldfinger@rutan.com
3 RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP
18575 Jamboree Road, 9th Floor
4 Irvine, California 92612
Telephone: 714-641-5100
5 Facsimile: 714-546-9035

6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs PIPE RESTORATION
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC and ACE DURAFLO
7 SYSTEMS, LLC

8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11

12 PIPE RESTORATION
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, a Nevada
13 Limited Liability Company; ACE
DURAFLO SYSTEMS, LLC, a Nevada
14 Limited Liability Company,

15 Plaintiffs,
16 vs.

17 FLORIDA DRAIN-LINING
SOLUTIONS, LLC, a Florida Limited
Liability Company; RONALD
18 CODDINGTON, an individual; and
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

19 Defendants.
20
21
22

Case No. 8:23-cv-00237-FWS-DFM

**PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED EX
PARTE APPLICATION FOR LEAVE
TO FILE SUR-REPLY BRIEF TO
RESPOND TO NEW EVIDENCE
AND ARGUMENT IN
DEFENDANTS' REPLY**

**(Memorandum of Points and
Authorities Attached hereto;
Declaration of Ronald P. Oines and
[Proposed] Order Filed Herewith)**

Hon. Fred W. Slaughter
Courtroom: 10D

23 **EX PARTE APPLICATION**

24 Plaintiffs PIPE RESTORATION TECHNOLOGIES, LLC ("PRT") and ACE
25 DURAFLO SYSTEMS, LLC ("ACE") (collectively, "Plaintiffs") submit this
26 *unopposed* Ex Parte Application for leave to file a brief sur-reply to respond to new
27 evidence and arguments made for the first time in Defendants' reply in support of
28 their Motion to dismiss or transfer ("Motion") (ECF no. 16).

NOTICE TO OPPOSING COUNSEL

Defendants FLORIDA DRAIN-LINING SOLUTIONS, LLC (“FDLS”) and RONALD CODDINGTON (“Coddington”) (collectively, “Defendants”) are represented by Otto Lee, Kevin Viau and Cecilia Liu (cliu@iplg.com) of Intellectual Property Law Group LLP, 1871 The Alameda, Suite 250, San Jose, CA 95126; Telephone: (408) 286-8933

Plaintiffs’ counsel gave notice of their intent to file this Application at approximately 3:52 p.m. on April 7, 2023. (Oines Dec. ¶ 2.) At 5:00 p.m. on April 7, 2023, Defendants’ counsel indicated by email that they do not oppose the relief sought by this Application. (*Id.*)

REASONS FOR SEEKING EX PARTE RELIEF

Defendants filed their Reply brief and new Coddington Declaration on April 6, 2023. The hearing on Defendants’ Motion is scheduled for April 20, 2023. Plaintiffs request that they be allowed to file a sur-reply brief prior to the April 20, 2023 hearing date. Plaintiffs suggest that they could file the sur-reply by April 13, 2023. In light of the upcoming hearing, Plaintiffs do not have time to file a fully noticed motion to seek leave to file a sur-reply.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Other than a Declaration from Coddington, Defendants did not submit any evidence in support of their Motion. In his Declaration filed in support of the Motion, Coddington referred to a February, 2012 “Consent to Transfer and Assumption of License Agreement,” (“Consent Agreement”) pursuant to which Coddington’s company, Florida Pipe-Lining Solutions, LLC, assumed all rights, duties and obligations under the pertinent License Agreement. (ECF no. 16-1, ¶ 10.) However, Defendants did not attach the Consent Agreement to Coddington’s Declaration or the Motion, and did not argue that the Consent Agreement supported Defendants’ argument that the forum selection clause does not apply to this case.

Plaintiffs filed their Opposition papers on March 30, 2023. (ECF nos. 18;

1 18-1; 18-2.) Defendants filed their Reply on April 7, 2023. (ECF no. 19.)
2 Defendants attached three exhibits to the Reply, including a copy of a Consent
3 Agreement. Defendants also submitted another 17 paragraph Declaration of
4 Coddington. (ECF 19-1.)

5 Most of the new evidence submitted is not even relevant to Defendants'
6 Motion. However, Defendants now argue that the Consent Agreement somehow
7 shows that Coddington did not agree to be bound by the venue clause in the License
8 Agreement. (ECF no. 19, pg. 2.) Plaintiffs assert that the Consent Agreement shows
9 just the opposite, i.e., that Coddington expressly agreed that the venue clause applies
10 to him and his company.

11 By this Application, Plaintiffs merely seek an opportunity to file a brief sur-
12 reply to address the three new exhibits and the new Declaration, and the new
13 arguments based on the new evidence, including the new argument based on the
14 Consent Agreement. As this Court recently held, "it is improper for a party to
15 introduce new facts or arguments beyond those raised in the moving papers." *Ponce*
16 *v. Medline Industries, LP*, 2023 WL 2628694 (C.D. Cal. 2023); citing *Schwartz v.*
17 *Upper Deck Co.*, 183 F.R.D. 672, 682 (S.D. Cal. 1999)("It is well accepted that
18 raising of new issues and submission of new facts in reply brief is improper.")

19 When a party submits new evidence or arguments in a reply, the Court should
20 permit the opposing party to respond to such new evidence and arguments in a sur-
21 reply brief. *United States v. Venture One Mortgage Corporation*, 2015 WL
22 12532139, *2 (S.D. Cal. 2015); *El Pollo Loco v. Hashim*, 316 F.3d 1032, 1040-41
23 (9th Cir. 2003).

24 Here, although Defendants referred to the Consent in their Motion, they did
25 not submit the Consent, and they did not argue that Coddington did not agree to the
26 venue clause. In the Motion, Defendants asserted, in pertinent part:

27 "In February 2012, ACE, FPLS and Coddington signed a Consent to
28 Transfer and Assumption Of License Agreements ("Consent") in

1 which the existing licensee at that time transferred 100% of its rights,
2 duties and obligations under and pursuant to the license agreement to
3 assignee FPLS. (Coddington. Decl. ¶10) Pursuant to the dispute
4 resolution clause in this Consent, ‘The parties to this Consent agree to
5 resolve any disputes arising out of this Consent pursuant to the dispute
6 resolution provisions in the License Agreement, including, without
7 limitation, the provisions addressing venue, choice of law and
8 attorneys’ fees.’ According to clause 22.07 Choice of Forum in the
9 license agreement, ‘Licensor and Licensee (and their respective
10 owners and guarantors if applicable) each agree that if litigation is
11 permitted under this Agreement, the sole forum for litigation arising
12 under this Agreement...will be an appropriate state or federal court in
13 California.’”

14 (Motion, pgs. 4:24-5:7.)

15 In the Motion, Defendants did not submit a copy of the Consent, did not
16 assert that Coddington crossed out any portion of the Consent, and did not seek to
17 argue that by crossing out a portion relating to a personal guaranty, Coddington
18 somehow also did not agree to the venue clause in the License Agreement and the
19 Consent.

20 By this Application, Plaintiffs simply wish to have an opportunity to respond
21 to Defendants, new evidence and new argument relating thereto.

22 **CONCLUSION**

23 Plaintiffs request an Order allowing them to file a sur-reply to address the
24 new evidence submitted by Defendants with their Reply and the new arguments
25 based thereon. Plaintiffs request that the Order allow a sur-reply up to 10 pages in
26 length, which would be filed on or before April 13, 2023. A proposed Order is
27 submitted herewith.

1 Dated: April 10, 2023

RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP
RONALD P. OINES
TALYA GOLDFINGER

2
3 By: /s/ Ronald P. Oines

4 Ronald P. Oines
5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs PIPE
6 RESTORATION TECHNOLOGIES,
7 LLC and ACE DURAFLO
8 SYSTEMS, LLC
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Certificate of Compliance

The undersigned, counsel of record for Plaintiffs Pipe Restoration Technologies, LLC and Ace Duraflo Systems, LLC, certifies that this brief contains _____ words, which complies with the word limit of L.R. 11-6.1.

Dated: April 10, 2023

RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP
RONALD P. OINES
TALYA GOLDFINGER

By: /s/ Ronald P. Oines

Ronald P. Oines
Attorneys for Plaintiffs PIPE
RESTORATION TECHNOLOGIES,
LLC and ACE DURAFLO
SYSTEMS, LLC